UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/545,707	04/07/2000	Sundaram Ramakesavan	42390.P8181	1262

7590 11/16/2005

David Kaplan
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, LE V	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2174	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/545,707	RAMAKESAVAN, SUNDARAM	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Le Nguyen	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 September 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11-15 and 18-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-9,11-15 and 18-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 9/12/05.

2. Claims 1-9, 11-15 and 18-27 are pending in this application; and claims 1, 8 and 18 are independent claims. Claims 2 and 25 have been amended; and, claims 10, 16 and 17 have been cancelled.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1, 4-9, 12-15, 18, 21-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. ("Wagner") in view of Pennock et al. ("Pennock").

As per claim 1, Wagner teaches a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising:

(a) displaying a first list of names on a display screen of a first electronic device coupled to the wireless network (fig. 3A, *"Address Book"*);

(b) receiving a broadcast of a wireless identification signal from a second electronic device (col. 6, lines 40-41; *an identification signal such as a telephone number that is unfamiliar to the user of the first device appears in the display screen;* col. 6, lines 24-45; col. 8, lines 22-24 and lines 49-54*; i.e. users may send messages to multiple electronic devices*); and

(c) providing an option on the first electronic device to rename the default name associated with the second electronic device to a local name (col. 4, lines 55-58; *user may access various functions of a telephone address book such as inherent functions of editing/renaming an address book*).

Although Wagner teaches displaying a visual cue on the display screen, in response to receiving a broadcast of a wireless identification signal from a second electronic device, wherein a broadcast of a wireless identification signal being sent to multiple electronic devices, the cue identifying a default name associated with the second electronic device in the first list of names of electronic devices (col. 6, lines 40-41), Wagner does not explicitly disclose a visual cue displayed on the display screen to single out a target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen and responsive to receiving the wireless identification signal, identifying a target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen as being associated with the second electronic device wherein each name in the first list is associated with an active electronic device. Pennock teaches a visual cue displayed on the display screen to single out a target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen and responsive to receiving the wireless identification signal, identifying the target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen as being associated with the second electronic device wherein each name in the first list is associated with an active electronic device (figs. 6, 8, 9-15 and 18; col. 6, line 57 through col. 7, line 40; col. 8, lines 30-43; col. 12, lines 57-64; col. 18, lines 57-64; *responsive to receiving a wireless*

signal from a second device such as a mobile phone that the second device is logged-on, a visual cue, i.e. such as Burt, Don, Chuck's darkened base icon in pane 72 and 152, is displayed on the first device to identify the target name from a first list of names as being associated with the second electronic device; moreover, each name in the first list is associated with an active electronic device). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Pennock's visual cue displayed on the display screen to single out a target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen and responsive to receiving the wireless identification signal, identifying a target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen as being associated with the second electronic device wherein each name in the first list is associated with an active electronic device to Wagner's display of a visual cue on the display screen, in response to receiving a broadcast of a wireless identification signal from a second electronic device, wherein a broadcast of a wireless identification signal being sent to multiple electronic devices, the cue identifying a default name associated with the second electronic device in the first list of names of electronic devices so that users may view a list of all present participants.

As per claim 4, the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising an option to broadcast a wireless activation signal to multiple user-selected electronic devices from the first list of names of electronic devices, the activation signal to cause the user-selected electronic devices to identify themselves using an audio or visual cue (Wagner: figs. 3A and 4; *upon receiving a signal from another electronic device, a visual cue "Sue Smith" is displayed*;

Pennock: col. 9, lines 7-42; *the recipient of the signal responds to the first electronic device with an audio or a visual cue by using the dialog box or microphone*).

As per claim 5, the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising providing a data exchange option on the first electronic device to send a file to the second electronic device, the data exchange option identifying the second electronic device by the local name (Wagner: *see figs. 5, 8 and respective portions of the specification; stock information and stock quotes are sent in batch files over the wireless networking device*; Pennock: col. 9, lines 7-42).

As per claim 6, the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network wherein displaying the first list of names is done in response to a user of the first electronic device selecting a wireless network mapping menu option (Wagner: fig 3A; *selecting an address book*).

Claim 7 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 8 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 4 and 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 9 is similar in scope to claim 1(b) and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 1(c) and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 24, the modified Wagner teaches a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising providing an option on the first electronic device to rename the target name associated with the second electronic device to a local name (Wagner: col. 4, lines 55-58; *user may access various functions of a telephone address book such as inherent functions of editing/renaming an address book*).

As per claim 25, the modified Wagner teaches a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising receiving a broadcast of a wireless

identification signal from a second electronic device, the identification signal including a first default name assigned by a user of the second electronic device (Pennock: figs. 6, 8, 9-15 and 18; *first default name assigned by a user of the second electronic device*).

As per claim 27, the modified Wagner teaches a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising providing an option on the first electronic device to rename the default name associated with the second electronic device to a local name (Wagner: col. 4, lines 55-58; *user may access various functions of a telephone address book such as inherent functions of editing/renaming an address book*).

5. Claims 2, 3, 11, 19, 20 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. ("Wagner") in view of Pennock et al. ("Pennock") as applied to claims 1, 8 and 18, and further in view of Smith et al. ("Smith").

As per claim 2, although the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising an option to broadcast a wireless identification signal from the first electronic device to multiple electronic devices, including the second electronic device the identification signal including a first default name of the first electronic device being assigned by a user of the first electronic device (Pennock: figs. 6, 8, 9-15 and 18) and in response to the second electronic device unable to translate the first default name, displaying a visual cue on the display screen of the second device the cue identifying the first electronic device (Wagner: col. 6, lines 57-63; *if the second electronic device is unable to match the first default name to a name in the rolodex, a visual cue on the display screen of the second device*

identifying the first electronic device is displayed in accordance with conventional caller ID technology, i.e. a number is displayed in place of a name), the modified Wagner does not explicitly disclose the cue identifying a second default name associated with the first electronic device from a second list of names of a plurality of electronic devices (Smith: col. 12, lines 38-48). Smith teaches a visual cue identifying a second default name associated with the first electronic device from a second list of names of a plurality of electronic devices (col. 12, lines 38-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Smith's teaching of a visual cue identifying a second default name associated with the first electronic device from a second list of names of a plurality of electronic devices in a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network to the modified Wagner's teaching of a visual cue on the display screen of the second device the cue identifying the first electronic device in a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network in order to provide a user a way of quickly identifying a signal when only part of the signal's data is known.

As per claim 3, the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising an option to broadcast a wireless activation signal to a user-selected electronic device from the first list of names of electronic devices, the activation signal to cause the user-selected electronic device to identify itself using an audio or visual cue (Wagner: figs. 3A and 4; *upon receiving a signal from another electronic device, a visual cue "Sue Smith" is displayed*).

Claim 11 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19, which is dependent on claim 18, is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 20, the modified Wagner teaches a computer-readable medium comprising a plurality of instructions readable therefrom, the instructions, when executed by a first electronic device, cause the first electronic device to perform operations comprising an option to broadcast a wireless activation signal to multiple user-selected electronic devices from the first list of names of electronic devices, the activation signal to cause the user-selected electronic devices to identify themselves using an audio or visual cue (Wagner: figs. 3A and 4; *upon receiving a signal from another electronic device, a visual cue "Sue Smith" is displayed*).

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 9/12/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued the following:

(a) Pennock fails to disclose identifying a target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen as being associated with the second electronic device responsive to receiving the wireless identification signal or displaying a visual cue on the display screen to single out the target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen responsive to receiving the wireless identification signal.

(b) Neither Wagner nor Pennock discloses the feature of providing an option to broadcast a wireless activation signal from the first electronic device to a selected electronic device associated with a name from the first list of names, the activation signal to cause the selected electronic device associated with the name from the list of names to identify itself to the first electronic device using an audio or a visual cue.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (a), Pennock does teach that responsive to receiving a wireless signal from a second device such as a mobile phone (col. 18, lines 57-64) that the second device is logged-on, a visual cue, i.e. such as Burt, Don, Chuck's darkened base icon in pane 72 and 152, is displayed on the first device to identify the target name from a first list of names as being associated with the second electronic device wherein each name in the first list is associated with an active electronic device (figs. 6, 8, 9-15 and 18; col. 6, line 57 through col. 7, line 40; col. 8, lines 30-43; col. 12, lines 57-64).

Per (b), Wagner and Pennock teaches an activation signal from a first electronic device to another electronic device (Wagner: figs. 3A and 4; Pennock: col. 9, lines 7-11; *user of a first electronic device sends an invitation to user of another electronic device*), causing the recipient of the signal (the other electronic device) to identify itself to the first electronic device using an audio or a visual cue (Pennock: col. 9, lines 7-42; *the recipient of the signal responds to the first electronic device with an audio or a visual cue via use of the dialog box or microphone*).

Inquires

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

LVN
Patent Examiner
November 4, 2005

SY LUU
PRIMARY EXAMINER